

LC IIII

C3

1014
C8

Catholic Citizens

= and =

Public Education.

A brief Statement giving Report of
Attendance and Expenses of Parish
Schools in the City of New York.

Catholic World Magazine

THE CATHOLIC BOOK EXCHANGE,
120 West 60th Street,
New York.

—
1902

LC III
.C3

26
/

THIS pamphlet is reprinted from the January issue of THE CATHOLIC WORLD MAGAZINE. THE CATHOLIC WORLD MAGAZINE is published by the Paulist Fathers, at 120 West 60th Street, New York. \$3.00 a year.

SUBSCRIBE FOR IT.

CATHOLIC CITIZENS AND PUBLIC EDUCATION.

*A BRIEF STATEMENT GIVING REPORT OF ATTENDANCE AND
EXPENSES OF PARISH SCHOOLS IN THE CITY OF NEW
YORK.*

THE PARISH SCHOOL is a factor in the public educational work of the United States and should not be classified under the heading of Private Schools, in which large tuition fees are charged and social distinctions recognized to favor the children of the wealthy. No such limitations are met with in the Parish Schools, founded and supported, with few exceptions, by representatives of the common people.

According to existing laws in New York State, citizens have the unquestionable right as parents and guardians to provide for the religious and secular education of their children. This right is exercised by the educational associations, formed within parish boundaries, to establish and perpetuate Parish Schools chiefly for kindergarten training and elementary instruction. The citizens who form these societies are sincerely devoted to the public welfare, and would quickly resent any imputation against their patriotism. They demand for their children definite and dogmatic religious instruction, according to the faith professed by at least two hundred and fifty millions of Catholics throughout the world. It is well understood that the teaching of religion is not within the power of the State: neither can the public funds be used in aid or in maintenance of any particular form of religious belief.

At the present time, in New York State, the patrons of Christian Education are paying from their own hard-earned money the cost of educating about one hundred and fifty thousand children in the Catholic Parish Schools. For the defence of their conscientious convictions, they have erected in many places commodious fire-proof buildings, thus relieving their fel-

of love to assist in the movement to remove false impressions and bring about a better understanding of the gigantic work that has been done in Catholic Schools for God and our Country.

Committee of New York Catholic School Board.	Right Rev. MONSIGNOR MOONEY, LL.D., V.G., <i>Director of the Sacred Heart School.</i>
	Very Rev. DENIS PAUL O'FLYNN, <i>Director of St. Joseph's School.</i>
	Rev. MICHAEL J. LAVELLE, LL.D., <i>Director of St. Patrick's Cathedral School.</i>
	Rev. THOMAS McMILLAN, C.S.P., <i>Director of Schools of Paulist Fathers.</i>

ARCHDIOCESE OF NEW YORK.

Report of the cost of maintenance, number of pupils, number of Teachers, and the valuation of Parish School Property in the Boroughs of Manhattan, Bronx, and Richmond, New York City, for the year ending December 31, 1901.

MANHATTAN BOROUGH.

Name.	Location.	Pupils.	Teachers.	Cost of Maintenance.	Property and Buildings. Value.
Cathedral, .	111-113 E. 50th St.,	1,485	35	\$19,689.84	\$200,000
St. Agnes, .	152-156 E. 44th St.,	785	17	6,173.46	125,000
St. Alphonsus,	328 W. Broadway,	706	13	4,914.05	125,000
Annunciation,	West 131st St.,	590	12	979.03	25,000
St. Ann, . .	115-117 E. 11th St.,	101	3	702.44	100,000
St. Anthony,	60 McDougal St.,	887	15	950.09	30,000
Assumption,	West 49th St.,	537	11	1,054.26	50,000
St. Boniface,	312-314 E. 47th St.,	261	5	126.50	40,000
St. Brigid, .	302-304 E. 8th St.,	742	16	6,953.09	39,000
St. Cecilia, .	218-224 E. 106th St.,	1,182	20	8,452.49	160,000
St. Columba,	331 West 25th St.,	467	7	2,549.35	75,000
Epiphany, .	234-238 E. 22d St.,	732	17	6,361.60	100,000
St. Francis, .	146 West 32d St.,	154	5	1,093.11	30,000
St. Fr. Xavier,	122-126 W. 17th St.,	1,101	20	10,456.21	180,000
St. Gabriel, .	307-321 E. 36th St.,	1,694	31	12,927.71	150,000
Holy Cross, .	332-336 W. 43d St.,	1,025	22	10,865.62	125,000
H'ly Innocents,	130-132 W. 37th St.,	329	9	5,838.99	125,000
Holy Trinity,	212 West 83d St.,				60,000

<i>Name.</i>	<i>Location.</i>	<i>Pupils.</i>	<i>Teachers.</i>	<i>Cost of Maintenance.</i>	<i>Property and Buildings. Value.</i>
St. Ignatius,	46 East 84th St.,	610	16	\$4,779.48	\$75,000
Imm. Concep.,	511-513 E. 14th St.,	1,893	37	18,658.98	150,000
St. James,	27-31 James St.,	1,008	16	9,801.41	125,000
St. Jean Bap't,	187 East 76th St.,	345	8	2,872.65	75,000
St. John Bap't,	206-208 W. 31st St.,	337	8	1,793.25	60,000
St. Joseph, .	111 Washington Pl.,	1,017	25	17,060.69	150,000
St. Joseph, .	420-422 E. 87th St.,	953	16	13,205.90	100,000
St. Joseph, .	1348 Columbus Ave.,	550	10	4,905.13	75,000
St. Margaret,	Riverdale,	80	2		
St. Mary, .	262-268 Madison St.,	640	16	5,699.43	100,000
St. Mary					
Magdalen,	523 East 17th St.,	195	4	1,000.00	40,000
St. Michael,	377-381 Ninth Ave.,	1,540	33	12,912.58	160,000
St. Monica, .	406-416 E. 80th St.,	1,020	21	6,631.39	160,000
H'ly Redeemer,	222-224 E. 4th St.,	829	13	4,924.05	100,000
St. Nicholas,	121-135 E. 2d St.,	420	9	5,368.64	75,000
Our Lady of					
Loretto, .	299-301 Eliz'beth St.,	723	10	2,476.99	60,000
Our Lady of					
Mt. Carmel,	443-445 E. 115th St.,	848	12	3,138.44	80,000
Our Lady of					
Perp. Help,	321 East 61st St.,	351	6	2,012.48	50,000
Our Lady of					
Angels, .	229-239 E. 112th St.,	367	11	3,791.97	50,000
Our Lady of					
Sorrows, .	Pitt and Stanton Sts.,	335	7	6,111.00	50,000
St. Patrick, .	Prince St.,	2,100	33	15,708.48	150,000
St. Paul, . .	120-122 E. 118th St.,	575	10	3,252.30	75,000
St. Paul the					
Apostle, .	124 West 60th St.,	1,125	22	12,006.92	130,000
St. Peter, .	98-102 Trinity Pl.,	844	21	13,975.13	150,000
Sacred Heart,	450-456 W. 51st St.,	2,350	39	23,819.46	125,000
St. Stephen,	141-147 E. 28th St.,	957	29	9,427.20	150,000
St. Stanislaus,	103-107 7th St.,	95	2	207.90	10,000
St. Teresa, .	6-8 Rutgers St.,	343	8	2,837.49	80,000
Transfigurat'n,	29 Mott St.,	320	6	982.36	20,000
St. Veronica,	116-118 Le Roy St.,	480	10	4,552.14	60,000
St. Vincent	Lexington Ave. and				
Ferreri, .	65th St.,	875	15	8,730.76	140,000
St. Vincent					
de Paul, .	116 West 24th St.,	550	14	6,257.45	75,000
		37,453	747	328,989.89	4,639,000

RECAPITULATION.

Manhattan Borough, . .	37,453	747	\$328,989.89	\$4,639,000
Bronx Borough, . . .	2,409	42	9,469.73	200,000
Richmond Borough, . .	1,287	22	5,824.98	60,000
Grand Total, . . .	41,149	811	\$344,284.60	\$4,899,000

NOTE.—The value of school buildings as stated is probably well below the actual value to-day, representing as it does in practically all cases merely original cost. As regards maintenance, it will be noticed that the average cost per pupil in Manhattan was only about eight dollars. The reason for this is, of course, mainly in the fact that a very large proportion of the teachers in the Catholic parish schools are religious, who receive little pay for their work. Another reason for the low maintenance cost is no doubt the fact that in many cases expenses of lighting and heating the schools, interest on mortgage for school building, etc., are charged directly to church account of each parish.

The figures here given indicate only the attendance at Parish Schools in the boroughs mentioned, excluding colleges, academies, and institutions containing children not living at home with their parents. It is important to make the distinction that the Parish School is in direct communication with the home influences, and is to be differentiated from institutions for destitute and homeless children. In the whole Archdiocese of New York, which extends up the Hudson River as far as Newburgh, there is a total of 49,752 pupils in the Parish Schools. This number, taken in conjunction with the reports from asylums and institutions, shows about 71,000 under Catholic care and instruction.

By a peculiar juggling of the figures in the official reports of education in New York State there has been as yet no satisfactory statement concerning the Catholic Schools, no distinct mention of the large number of volunteer workers for the uplifting of the masses. Among these workers who have been thus deprived of honorable mention are to be found representatives of many prominent families enrolled in philanthropic and religious organizations. A census that misrepresents the work done by the people of New York State for education, or

which presents only in a partial way the evidence of their generous zeal, deserves severe condemnation. It is to the glory of the Empire State that so many of its citizens do not need any compulsory law to enforce attendance at school. They take the initiative in promoting the standard of intelligent citizenship. It is to be hoped, therefore, that public officials will give adequate consideration to the following summary of attendance in the Parish Schools of New York State, and the estimate of Catholic population according to the dioceses representing all the counties:

	<i>Pupils.</i>	<i>Catholic Population.</i>
New York,	49,752	1,200,000
Brooklyn,*	34,161	500,000
Buffalo,	22,712	171,000
Rochester,	15,734	105,000
Albany,	15,000	145,000
Syracuse,	4,943	70,000
Ogdensburg,	3,400	79,000

WORK OF THE PARISH SCHOOLS.

Our Catholic school system includes all grades of instruction, from the nursery and the kindergarten to the university. It comprises orphan asylums and industrial schools, parish schools, convents, academies, colleges, seminaries, and universities. They all of them have this in common: That while imparting such knowledge as is required for the secular profession, the chief cause of their existence is to educate Catholic children in the doctrines and practices of their faith. No attempt has been made to organize our Catholic institutions into a complete system, a living whole, with unity of plan and purpose. They have sprung up according to exigencies of time and place. . . . Liberty of action in using different methods need not interfere with efficiency of work done. . . . But

* Parish schools of diocese of Brooklyn are chiefly located in boroughs of Brooklyn and Queens.

amid all this variety as regards the means, there is unity as regards the end for which our Catholic institutions exist. Keeping in view that end, we shall cast a hasty glance at our schools. . . .

That portion of our educational system which is dearest to the heart of every Catholic is our Parish Schools. These schools have been multiplied and fostered at great sacrifices—financial sacrifices on the part of the laity who contributed to their erection and maintenance; sacrifices of life on the part of religious teachers; . . . sacrifices on the part of the clergy who deprived themselves in many ways in order that the parish schools might flourish. The parish school system, be its defects and shortcomings what they may, is indispensable for the preservation of the Catholic religion in the hearts of our Catholic children. It is the nursery of the faith for the rising generation.

Every Catholic clergyman ministering at the altar of God; every Catholic layman having at heart the survival, the strengthening, and the propagation of his faith, desires a parish school in which those boys and girls who are to be the future men and women of their Church shall receive a solid religious training. Our Protestant brethren attempted another plan. They sent their children to schools from which all religious creeds were banished, and by their Sunday-schools and religious libraries sought to supply the lack of religious training. Did they succeed? . . . Their plan has ended in failure. From Methodist and Lutheran, from Baptist and Presbyterian and Episcopalian, the wail has gone forth that the young men and women of the day are abandoning the creeds of their fathers and that their churches are becoming deserted.

Would matters have been any better a hundred years ago if the early settlers had not maintained strictly denominational schools? Would Catholicism flourish in the country as it is now flourishing if there had been no Catholic schools in which children might inhale a Catholic atmosphere, study Catholic catechism, learn their Catholic prayers, and imbibe for the Church, her sacraments, and her clergy that reverence which is

the envy and the admiration of the outside world? Certainly not. There may be difference of opinion as to the ways and means by which Catholic education is to be imparted and Catholic schools are to be supported, but there can be none regarding the self-evident truth that if the Church in America is to be perpetuated in a robust, God-fearing and God-serving Catholicity, it is only by the establishment of a Catholic school in every Catholic parish. This result is not accomplished, this result cannot be accomplished, in neutral schools. . . .

When we consider the history of Catholic education during the fifty years that have just elapsed, and note the many serious obstacles which our Catholic schools have had to contend with, and at the same time go over the roll-call of prominent Catholics who have had their early training in these schools—archbishops, bishops, and priests, and religious men and women whose vocation has been fostered in them; eminent laymen now filling positions of trust and honor, whose consciences were there formed, and who had there learned to be proud of their faith and to practise its teachings to the best of their ability—we are compelled to regard these schools, even in their least efficient forms, with great respect. In no sense are they failures. In no sense are they to be abandoned or neglected; rather, in the very words of Leo XIII. concerning these schools, “every effort should be made to multiply Catholic schools and to bring them to perfect equipment.” . . . There are . . . great difficulties to be overcome in maintaining and promoting the parish school. The fact is not for a moment to be lost sight of that our parish schools, as at present managed, are a great burden upon the people and a great source of solicitude for the clergy. On account of their limited resources they are restricted in the sphere of their usefulness. . . .

The brotherhoods and sisterhoods that are teaching orders are with great difficulty and much economizing scarcely enabled to make ends meet, out of the pittance that they receive as salary. . . . Inquire into the extent of that salary; think of the plain, bare mode of life that these religious lead; figure out their many privations—not physical or mental privations,

for these they do not reckon, but privations as regards books, charts, school apparatus and conveniences for study, that it is impossible for them to purchase and that they must go without, unless indeed a thoughtful pastor should supply these deficiencies at his own expense or the expense of his parish—and you may form a slight conception of the odds against which they are working, and how heavily handicapped they are in the race for excellence. Withal they have shown that a skilful workman, even with an inferior quality of tools, can produce good results. But, could these privations be lessened, and the burden upon the parishes lightened, could our religious teachers receive sufficient support to enable them to enter upon their work untrammelled, then indeed might we look for results that would be worthy of the cause.—*Adapted from a Paper by the late Brother Azarias.*

MORAL TRAINING FOR CHILDREN.

The *Educational Review* contains this remarkable statement: "It is a matter of statistics that one-half of all the children who go to school *leave before the age of eleven*, and that three-fourths of them *leave before they are twelve*." Here is an unquestioned fact for earnest students of the science of education to consider. Patriotic citizens must take cognizance of the moral welfare of this vast body of children who leave school before the age of twelve. Theories will not suffice. Practical methods of teaching morality are urgently demanded.

No one has yet dared to affirm that moral training for children is unnecessary, or that the state should assume an attitude of indifference toward virtue and vice. Various opinions exist as to the ways and means best adapted for the teaching of morality, but there is now becoming manifest a general agreement among Christian denominations that the most improved methods of the modern educator should be utilized in favor of the soul's higher aspirations.

The good citizen, the reliable merchant, the incorruptible official holding a place which demands a lofty standard of con-

duct, are personifications of moral convictions. Great is the demand for men of this type, and the supply is not regulated entirely by the demand. The same rule is true in the domestic circle. Progressive civilization has not yet produced too many good husbands and exemplary wives. The moral virtues, prudence, justice, fortitude, and temperance, are incorporated as parts in a whole, and take concrete shape in the great characters of every nation.

Experience shows that these noble moral qualities are not of spontaneous growth. There is a process of evolution in each individual which is variable and dependent on external as well as internal causes. A large class of people in the United States seem unable to distinguish between the Christian and pagan standard of education. The charge reasonably made against them is, that they profess to be satisfied with very imperfect results in religious instruction, and unjustly accuse of a want of patriotism those who try to point out their error.

We Catholics have no desire to disturb the friendly relations existing among American citizens when we assert our convictions as to the teaching of Christian morality. It is a subject on which we are entitled to form an opinion and express it vigorously. The good work done in Catholic schools for secular education demands official recognition and a fair share of the funds which the State collects for school purposes. It is false Americanism, and was condemned by the founders of the Republic, to establish by law a system of education which imposes taxation without representation.—*Rev. Thomas McMillan, C.S.P.*

SECTARIAN SCHOOLS.

To the Editor of the New York Times :

Very many of your readers have been pained by an editorial that appeared in your issue of April 22 on the subject of "Sectarian Schools." Throughout the article it seems to be assumed that the public schools are non-sectarian. This word, "non-sectarian," as applied to institutions, had been used in such a loose way that many have come to think that it means

an institution that is not ostensibly Protestant, Catholic, or Jewish. I would not wish to think that one so scholarly as a *Times* editor would so use the word. What is a non-sectarian school? Certainly it is any school that is not directed according to the principles of any sect, whether religious or irreligious—for we have irreligious sects, like the Agnostics and Indifferentists, quite as well as religious sects like the Presbyterians or Methodists.

Is a non-sectarian school possible? Let us see. Either the school admits in its teaching that God exists or that He does not exist, or that it does not know whether he exists or not. If it admits that He exists, then it is theistic; if it supposes that He does not exist, then it is atheistic; if it professes not to know whether He exists or not, then it is agnostic. We will go a step further. The ideas directing the school admit either that God has made a revelation, or deny a revelation, or hold that they do not know or that they do not care whether there is a revelation, or that they will have nothing to say on the question, and leave the pupils to think as they please of it. In every one of these cases the school is still "sectarian," and the principles advocated determine the school and put it in accord with a particular set or sect which advocates these principles. There may be no name yet invented for the sect of men who advocate the particular principle involved, but since there must be a principle at the root of every school system that system becomes allied to the sect advocating that principle.

Now, are our public schools influenced by the principles of any sect? Most certainly they are. They are influenced by the principles of the sect which wishes to have schools without any religious instruction. You may remember that our great statesman, Daniel Webster, gave his opinion of such schools in his famous speech in the Girard case. He said: "It is a mockery and an insult to common sense to maintain that a school for the instruction of youth from which Christian instruction by Christian teachers is sedulously and religiously shut out is not deistic and infidel both in its purpose and in its tendency." And Mr. John C. Spencer, Superintendent of Public

Instruction in the State of New York about the beginning of the present school system, writing to Governor Seward in regard to sectarianism in education, said: "It is an error to suppose that the absence of all religious instruction, if it were practicable, is a mode of avoiding sectarianism. On the contrary, it would be in itself sectarian, because it would be consonant to the views of a particular class, and opposed to the opinions of other classes. Those who reject creeds and resist all efforts to infuse them into the minds of the young would be gratified by a system which so fully accomplishes their purpose."

According to Mr. Spencer, our public schools are "sectarian," though they exclude all religious instruction, because they are guided by the views consonant to the sect of Indifferentists and opposed to the views of many other people.

We are all taxed for the education of the children of this State. More than \$30,000,000 are to be devoted to this purpose during the present year. Why should any of our citizens who wish to have children educated according to their own particular views not have a right to their own share of the money appropriated for education? They do not ask "money from others," as the *Times* editorial put it. The taxes appropriated are for the education of all the children in the State. If the Methodists have thousands of these children in their missions and the Episcopalians thousands more in their institutions, and the Jews an equal number, and the Catholics their thousands in the parish schools, why is it unjust to recognize the educational work that is done according to the will of these parents? If the State is going to interfere in education, it ought not to educate only according to the views of the Indifferentists and tell all Protestants and Catholics who object that they are asking other people to pay for the education of their children. There is no reason why Methodists, Lutherans, and Episcopalians may not justly claim their pro rata for the education of their children, and Catholics and Jews do the same. They are not asking other people's money. The Catholics, Protestants, and Jews have been taxed as well as the Indifferentists, and these last gentlemen have no right to absorb

practically the whole education fund, and then say to other people: "You cannot have any of our money." By what right do the handful of Indifferentists call the public money gathered through general taxation theirs? It is set apart for the education of all the children in the State, and every child has an equal right to a share in it.

The parents have the final right to say in what religion the child is to be educated; the State must devise ways and means to satisfy this just demand. This has been done in England and in many other countries, and can easily be done here. The State, having set apart the money of citizens for education, has no right to insist that its citizens must pay again for special schools, or else send their children to public schools "infidel in purpose and tendency."

This whole school question may be settled in the same way as the question of charitable institutions has been settled. In these institutions the State pays from its general taxation per capita for the work done for its wards. So with the education of the children. If the State is to support education by general taxation, it ought to consider the rights of the citizens to freedom of conscience in the education of their children. The State cannot in justice say to any of its citizens: You must be taxed, but you cannot have any share of this taxation for the education of your children unless you surrender these children to a system which Daniel Webster insisted is infidel in its purpose and tendency.

AN EDUCATOR.

New York, April 25, 1901.



THE SCHOOL QUESTION,

FROM A CATHOLIC POINT OF VIEW.

BY THE REV. PHILIP R. McDEVITT,
Superintendent of Parish Schools in Philadelphia.

In the Report for 1899-1900 of the Commissioner of Education, Hon. W. T. Harris, the following interesting and valuable statistics are given. There are in the

	<i>Public.</i>	<i>Private.</i>	
Elementary Schools,	14,662,488	1,193,882	pupils.
Secondary Schools,	488,549	166,678	
Universities and Colleges,	30,050	73,201	
Professional Schools,	8,540	46,594	
Normal Schools,	44,808	23,572	
	<hr/>	<hr/>	
	15,234,435	1,503,927	
	<hr/>	<hr/>	

ENROLLMENT IN SPECIAL SCHOOLS.

City Evening Schools,	185,000
Business Schools,	70,686
Indian Schools,	23,500
Schools for Defectives,	23,691
Reform Schools,	24,925
Orphan Asylums and other Benevo- lent Institutions,	14,000
Schools in Alaska,	1,369
Kindergartens,	93,737
Miscellaneous,	50,000
	<hr/>
	486,908
	<hr/>

Summarizing, then, we find total enrollment was 17,225,270, distributed as follows:

In Public Institutions,	15,234,435
In Private Institutions,	1,503,927
In Special Schools,	486,908

Under the term Common Schools the Report includes public schools of elementary and secondary grades; the former including all pupils in the first eight years of the course of study, and the latter the pupils of the next four years of the course usually conducted in high-schools or academies.

In educating the vast number that attend the Common Schools (15,151,037), 415,660 teachers were employed, and to meet the expenses of these schools the sum of \$204,017,612 was raised; the average expenditure for each child being \$18.99. This enormous outlay, as well as the vast number of pupils enrolled, clearly demonstrate the high place that popular education holds in the estimation of the American people; this fact is emphasized when we compare with it the corresponding data shown by other countries.

THE CATHOLIC-AMERICAN IS NO LAGGARD.

That the Catholic-American is no laggard in this great educational work is proved by statistics of our Catholic educational institutions during the year 1899-1900, which give 3,812 parish schools with an enrollment of 903,980 pupils, 183 colleges for boys, and 617 academies for girls; the enrollment in the latter not being given. It is safe, then, to say that nearly 1,000,000 pupils of all grades are being educated under distinctly Catholic influences. While, therefore, other private educational institutions outside of the Catholic Church are important in number, character, and enrollment of pupils, it is clear that the Catholic schools contain double the number that are being educated in all the other schools not of distinctly public character.

In the education of the youth of our country, then, we find two clearly defined agencies working side by side: one, the creation of the state; the other, the offspring of private enterprise. The state supports hers from a revenue obtained by the taxation of all classes without exception; the other is maintained by the generosity of private individuals, and receives no financial aid, and very little professional recognition, from state authority. The dominating thought and purpose of both

agencies are the same—the formation and development of character, and the instilling of those principles which beget the highest ideal of true womanhood and manhood. Though this high end is the aim of all educators, there is some variance of opinion as to the means best suited to accomplish the end. The vast majority seem to believe that that end can, under existing circumstances, be best attained by the plan of education offered to all children in the common or state schools, while others find in that same plan a lack of what to them is essential in the development of a human being, namely, the religious instruction so wholly ignored in the public-school system. This difference of opinion accounts for the existence of both public and private schools. A few private institutions of learning owe their existence to the desire of some parents for social distinction, and their disinclination to allow their children to frequent schools wherein the lines of social caste lose effect; these schools differ from the public schools only in their exclusiveness. The majority, therefore, of private schools exist because conscientious and God-fearing parents recognize the necessity of daily religious instruction; and, as a result, parish schools are not merely *private* but distinctly Catholic, and the difference between them and the state school consists in the presence or absence of a religious atmosphere.

DIFFERENT VIEW-POINTS OF EDUCATORS.

All educators who believe in Christianity agree that religion and morality must have a share in the education of youth; they differ, however, as to the manner and time and place in which religion and morality are to be taught.

Education in its true and complete acceptance is the bringing out of all the powers of man. It means the training of the heart, the cultivation of the mind, and the development of the physical powers. A system of education which ignores any of these is defective, and becomes disastrous in proportion to the dignity and relative importance of the part that is neglected. I take it that, in the main, non-Catholics hold that moral training should be a part of the daily curriculum. Thus, in the

Boston course of study for the high-school we read: "In giving instruction in morals and manners, teachers will at all times exert their best endeavors to impress on the minds of youth the principles of piety and justice, and a sacred regard to truth; love of their country, humanity, and universal benevolence; sobriety, industry, and frugality; chastity, moderation, and temperance." This moral instruction, however, it is declared, shall have no trace or shadow of sectarian or doctrinal teaching, for in the course of study for primary schools of the same city it is said: "In giving this instruction teachers should keep strictly within the bounds of manners and morals, and thus avoid all occasion for treating of or alluding to sectarian subjects."

Again, I say, it is evident all agree as to the necessity of moral and religious teaching; there is no agreement as to the manner, places, and times wherein it is to be given. Outside of the Catholic Church it is almost universally maintained that, though morality may be inculcated in the school-room, all religious teaching is to be relegated to the church and the family circle.

THE CATHOLIC IDEA OF EDUCATION.

Catholics hold that as ever and always the child's soul and his duties to God are the highest and greatest, so there is no place, time, or method from which the teaching of morals and religion may be eliminated. They hold that as the knowledge of the relations of the creature to his Creator is the most sacred and essential of all subjects, the most imperative of all obligations, these relations shall receive at least as much attention as is given to any secular branch; that as a child cannot become proficient in reading, writing, or arithmetic without daily instruction therein, so neither can he acquire the necessary knowledge of God, his laws, his rewards and punishments, without the daily presentation of these truths. Nor do they believe that morality and religion are separable; that men will revere the law, if they ignore the lawgiver. Now, since morality has Divine sanction, to attempt to teach its princi-

ples without reference to the Divinity is to ignore the law-giver; yet just as surely as you speak of the Lawgiver, so surely do you trench on the ground of doctrinal teaching. But even should any one hold that religion and morality are separable, the Catholic Church, with her ages of experience, with her realization that religion and morality must be united; and knowing from the same experience that the instruction given her children at church and at home is inadequate for the requisite religious training of the child, has created a system of schools wherein religious, moral, and secular training shall go hand-in-hand for the perfecting of the whole human being. As says one of the ablest Catholic educators:

"However, we do not hold that religion can be imparted as is the knowledge of history or grammar; the repetition of the catechism or the reading of the Gospel is not religion. Religion is something more subtle, more intimate, more all-pervading; it speaks to the heart and the head; it is an ever-living presence in the school-room; it is reflected from the pages of our reading books. It is nourished by the prayers with which our daily exercises are opened and closed; it is brought in to control the affections, to keep watch over the imagination; it forbids to the mind any but useful, holy, and innocent thoughts; it enables the soul to resist temptation, it guides the conscience, inspires horror for sin and love of virtue. It must be an essential element of our lives, the very atmosphere of our breathing, the soul of every action.

"This is religion as the Catholic Church understands it, and this is why she seeks to foster the religious spirit in every soul confided to her, at all times, under all circumstances, without rest, without break, from the cradle to the grave" (*Brother Azarias*).

In the maintaining of her parish school the Catholic Church not only contends for the union of secular learning and religious training, but, furthermore, in the very contention, emphasizes the conscientious duty of Catholic parents to thus educate their offspring.

DANGERS OF STATE PATERNALISM.

There is undoubtedly at the present time a more than mere *tendency* towards state "paternalism." It is a fact, however much it may be deplored, that many parents are only too willing to relegate to the state the rights, duties, and responsibilities that devolve on them in this matter of education. The result of this shirking of duty on one side, and the assumption of it on the other, must, ultimately, be harmful to both. The family is the basal unit of the state; any weakness, much more any unsoundness, in the foundation or in any of the component parts imperils the whole of the edifice. If the parent does not fulfil his duty—far worse if he deliberately ignores it—the resultant moral and civic weakness must show itself in the character and stability of the state. Let me not be misunderstood on this point. I would not derogate one iota from the right of the state to look after the well-being of its citizens. But this right has its legitimate limits; neither do I admit the state's right of absolute control of the character of the education to be imparted to a pupil, any more than I would accord it the privilege of determining that pupil's religion.

The state surely may, and should, insist that her citizens should be fitted for the discharge of their duties to the commonwealth. If parents fail in their duty to their children, let the state step in and become father and mother to the outcast and neglected ones; but, in the name of natural right, let us remember that the state is not the *natural* but only a *foster* parent, and that the first duty and privilege as regards the child belongs to its parents by nature.

CHURCH STANDS FOR LAW AND ORDER.

More firmly than any other teaching body, the Church has ever stood for law and order. Her enemies make it a reproach that her conservatism at times stifles the aspirations of an oppressed people for natural freedom. But, guided by the Holy Spirit, and rich with the experience of nineteen hundred years among the nations of the earth, she insists that her children

shall respect and obey all civil power, because all authority comes from God. She may both see and feel the tyranny and oppression that are weighing down the people, but she knows that sometimes it is better to bear the ills we have than to attempt to escape to others we know not of.

The simple fact that the child lives in a little world, whether in a state school or in any private school, wherein it sees order, discipline, and self-restraint, exercises a deep influence on its whole being. Even in schools from whose curriculum all religious instruction is eliminated, if the cultivation of natural virtues from even purely natural motives be there emphasized, habits of mind and heart are developed that will have much to do with the character of the future citizen.

When, however, this wholesome influence is intensified by positive religious instruction that demands the acquisition and cultivation of virtues, not merely from natural but from supernatural motives also, then a mighty power works in the heart that will develop a deep and lasting reverence for all legitimate authority, and eventually give to the state a faithful citizen, a strong upholder of right and order. Well do we know that the more faithful a Catholic is to his faith and its teaching, the more loyal is he to the laws of the land; the God-fearing man must necessarily be the upright, law-abiding citizen. God and Fatherland are the dominant notes of Catholic teaching.

In the words of her Divine Founder, she bids her children "Render to Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's." If any one bearing the name of Catholic be found a law-breaker or a traitor to his country, he is a Catholic but in name. And to the same extent that he breaks the laws of the land, in so far does he ruthlessly defy the teachings of her whose name he bears.

LIBERTY TO EDUCATE AS IS DEEMED BEST.

As the very fact of our having Catholic schools has at times aroused comment, and even ill-feeling, I shall here advert to some facts that ought to be taken into consideration. One is the constitutional right of Catholics or any body of

citizens to establish schools, provided such schools be not incompatible with public morality, or not opposed to public welfare. Citizens have a right to use the public schools; if they renounce that right, it is no privilege to allow them to establish their own educational institutions. We often hear the self-constituted defenders and justifiers of the state system use emphatically the term "our schools," and "our public-school system." Allow me to remark that it is an impertinence for any individual to refer to the public schools as "our" schools, to the exclusion of Catholics, or any other members of the commonwealth. If the state schools do not, in Catholic estimation, afford all the facilities necessary for the acquisition of the highest moral virtue, we have the liberty of stating this fact and of providing other means; for it is also the constitutional right of any citizen, whether Catholic or Protestant, Jew or infidel, to criticise, condemn, approve or disapprove any institution which is the creation of the state and supported by general taxation.

Those outside the Church sometimes declare that the Catholic laity are not in sympathy with the policy of the Church in the matter of education; that it is bishops and priests alone that are unreservedly insistent on the question. Certainly it is true that some Catholic laymen think the position of the Church on education extreme and unnecessary. But to say that the Catholics of America are not substantially united on the Catholic Parish School question is to be sadly ignorant of the actual state of affairs. Catholics would indeed rejoice were they able in conscience to partake of the educational advantages provided by the state, for they are taxed to provide those advantages, yet they are also eager to support their parish school; and should they desire for their children an academical or collegiate education, they are willing to bear the additional expense incurred thereby. To their credit be it said, when the question of a choice between an education without religion and an education with religion is put plainly before them, there is no mistaking their position, even though they thereby burden themselves with financial sacrifice and self-denial.

The history of Catholic education shows that the most earnest advocates of its undying, unchangeable principles have been laymen, and, were any distinction to be made, the honor should go to laymen who are converts to the Catholic faith and have had personal experience of the disastrous effects of education without religion. Were this not the condition of affairs, neither the Church nor any other organization could force upon the people an institution as broad, as far-reaching, and as expensive as the parish-school system.

CATHOLICS NOT ALONE IN OPPOSITION TO EDUCATION WITHOUT RELIGION.

The opponents of Catholic education also say that we are practically alone in our opposition to purely secular training which eliminates religion. If they are at all conversant with current facts and opinions, such a contention is false; for among the most earnest defenders of religion in education are found men, non-Catholics, who voice their protest in no doubtful terms. I might cite many proofs of this, but shall content myself with the words of one who is an esteemed minister of religion—one who has been an educator for many years, has occupied a chair in one of our largest universities, and at present is president of the high-school of a city that boasts of nearly a million and a half population. I refer to Rev. Robert Ellis Thompson, President of the Central High-School of Philadelphia, who says:

“As to the sufficiency of religious instruction in church and Sunday-school, we reply that one of the first practical dangers of society is that the greatest truths that bear on human life shall come to be identified in the public mind with Sundays, churches, and Sunday-school. We certainly are helping that when we provide that the most aroused activities of a boy's mind shall be divorced from those truths, and that the subjects of science, literature, and history, with which church and Sunday-school cannot deal, shall be taught with a studied absence of reference to ‘the Divine Intelligence at the heart of things.’ What is this but a lesson in the practical atheism

that shuts God out of all but certain selected parts of life with which the young man may have as little to do as he pleases. What would be the effect upon a child's mind of excluding studiously all mention of his earthly father from his work and play for five or six days of the week, of treating all his belongings and relations without reference to the parents to whom he owes them, and permitting such reference only on stated times when they are declared in order."

"But the monstrosity and the mischievousness of such an arrangement would be as nothing to the scholastic taboo of the living God, to whom the child owes every breath of its daily life, who lies about it as a great flood of light and life seeking to enter in and possess its spirit, and who as much feeds its mind with knowledge and wisdom as its spirit with righteousness, and its body with earthly food, in providing 'food convenient for it'" (*Divine Order of Human Society*, pp. 189, 190).

Now, has any Catholic priest or layman spoken more emphatically on this subject than has Dr. Thompson? Again, he says:

"The Church, through its clergy, can bring to bear an authority in education of a highly ethical kind, which it is not easy for laymen to exert. It can supplement or replace parental authority more readily than a force of lay teachers. And it is less likely than they to be swayed by the intellectual fashions of the time, and the place; less likely to accept as its divinity the spirit of the age, because committed to a preference for what Jean Paul calls 'the spirit of all the ages.'"

There is no reason why the state should desire or claim the sole right of educating the youth of the country; to assert that it alone can properly carry on this work is to ignore or condemn the splendid history of the past, when the church or private energy were the only agencies that looked after the education of the masses.

THE STATE IS UNABLE TO EDUCATE ALL THE CHILDREN.

In many parts of this country the state is either unable or refuses to carry on alone the work. It is noteworthy that in

the City of Philadelphia there are not adequate school accommodations for thousands of children who are not Catholic, and this is only one instance of the existing state of affairs in other sections of the country. With such a shameful truth confronting it, the state should welcome the aid of other agencies in this great work. I may remark here, incidentally, that as the parish schools are educating 35,000 children in Philadelphia alone, were these schools to be closed 35,000 more would be on the streets. The most dangerous of all monopolies is that of education. Catholics are not singular in seeing danger in the state arrogating to itself the exclusive work of education.

Says Dr. Thompson:

"Nor do we really escape from the narrowing influence of class in setting aside the church's ministry in educational work. We only create another class, more certain to be narrow, professional, and, in the long run, obstructive to sound progress." "The teaching profession, in those countries of Europe in which the state system has been longest established, constitutes a new clergy, not behind any other clergy in dogmatism and intolerance, even while it claims to be pervaded by the 'liberal' and the 'modern' spirit. And those who are familiar with the teaching class in America, I think, must be aware of the tendency to move in the same direction, to regard teachers as a distinct body governed by an *esprit de corps* of their own, and bound to act together against every opposing interest, on the assumption that their ideas of the right and the fit are coextensive with sound principles of educational policy.—We may yet have a new clergy on our hands in America, and one whose numbers and unity may make them as inimical to the public interests as any priesthood of any church could be."

By judicious encouragement, by helpful sympathy, just financial aid, and proper supervision of private schools the state can accomplish all that can be achieved by its assuming complete control of education; yet by this mode of procedure it would avoid interfering with the parental rights and conscientious belief of her citizens.

I might touch here on the widely discussed policy of state recognition of Catholic schools. A stranger to our institutions and methods of government coming to this country and reading certain articles bearing on the school question might believe, were he a merely superficial observer, that arrayed on one side were the followers of the Catholic Church, insignificant in numbers and influence, hostile to existing state institutions, and out of harmony with the progressive spirit of the age; on the other were their opponents, influential in numbers, wealth, and intelligence; representative of all that is best and noblest in this broad land. He might also be led to think that Catholics were so unreasonably exacting, so unjustly insistent for recognition, that they were striving to force by law their non-Catholic fellow-citizens to support Catholic educational institutions.

CATHOLICS ARE NOT AN UNIMPORTANT MINORITY.

Yet Catholics are not an unimportant minority: they comprise from ten to fifteen millions of the population, they are an integral part of this great country, and history demonstrates their loyalty to the land of their birth or adoption, since in every crisis of our history their patriotism and fidelity have been in evidence. They look for no favor, privilege, or charity; they do demand a constitutional right to have a voice in the affairs of government. In seeking some financial recognition for their schools they are but asking that their own money, not other people's, shall be applied to the education of the children of the nation. Who shall dare say they ask more than their right? The state is not the absolute master of all moneys in its treasury. It is the custodian only, and justice requires that the moneys raised by general taxation be distributed according to the reasonable and just wishes of the tax-payers. Our opposition to the existing state of affairs proceeds from no sinister, selfish purpose.

The history of the agitation concerning denominational schools cannot but make Catholics think that partisan feeling and religious prejudice, and not the merits of the question,

have brought about the present state of public opinion—the unwillingness to look calmly and justly on the claims of the Catholic minority. It is a notorious fact that the so-called “non-sectarian” character was given to our state system of education only when Catholics asked, in justice, for such consideration as was accorded to the Protestant sects. One who is far from being *just*, much less partial, to the Catholic Church writes: “Many may be surprised to learn that the first appeal for a division of the public funds in the country was made by a Protestant denomination, and the first sectarian division actually made was to that body. The other Protestant churches, instead of objecting, attempted to obtain their share of the public school fund” (*Romanism vs. Public School System*, p. 1).

TO EXCLUDE RELIGION IS TO PROFESS IRRELIGION.

A common objection to the appropriation of any money from the public treasury to denominational schools is that such an act would be a violation of the fundamental law of the land, which recognizes no religion or sect. The government's basis is broad, ignoring party and creed. Does it ever occur to those who insist on this view that the very policy of excluding religious instruction from schools maintained by a general taxation is a *de facto* class legislation in favor of unbelievers and agnostics, and utterly opposed to the principles of Christian denominations? Unbelief is actually some kind of belief. Consequently, may not the mass of Christians justly protest against a system which permits any state institutions becoming tacitly an agency for the spread of infidelity?

It is said that the official machinery required to carry out a system which recognizes denominational schools would be so complicated as to be practically impossible because of the multitude of sects in the country which would claim recognition. Any agency which will meet the requirements of the state in the amount and character of the education demanded ought to receive recognition. The difficulties incidental to such recognition should not rule out of court any just claimant. Does the national government refrain from collecting its revenues

simply because from the Great Lakes to the Gulf of Mexico, from the Atlantic to the Pacific, a thoroughly disciplined army of revenue officers must be drafted into service? Does the insignificance of the tribute render the humblest citizen in the remotest town of the Union free from the tax-gatherer's demands?

THE CATHOLIC SCHOOL SYSTEM CANNOT BE IGNORED.

All that is asked is simply the recognition of results secured in good educational work. It is a good policy, affirmed over and over again in municipal administration, to utilize existing agencies. A hospital, though it be under denominational control, yet has facilities to treat accidents. The city authorizes it to run a public ambulance, and pays it for the public service it renders. Why not apply the same principle in matters of education? It makes no difference to a municipality what particular form of religion is taught, as long as good citizenship is cultivated; and if a corporation of men will give as good an education when tested by examination as the common school, why not compensate them for the work done?

There is no argument against the system. What is done in England, Germany, and Canada should not be impossible in the United States. In all these countries denominational schools are recognized. No unanswerable argument has ever been adduced which destroys the justice of the Catholic claim in the matter of education. There is a just solution of the difficulty. Catholics are not clamoring for what is unjust or unreasonable. The Catholic school system cannot be ignored by the state. It is a fact, a mighty fact, and one that has come to stay. The Catholic Church is contending for a principle, from which she can never recede.

Whether recognition come or not, she will continue her mission of educating a million children. If the state be sincere in the declaration that it looks to the welfare of the whole people, Catholic education will yet receive proper consideration. It should be recognized, because recognition of the reasonable demands of the minority has ever characterized broad states-

manship and wise leadership. Fair treatment harmonizes and makes loyal the minority of a country.

The summary dismissal of every Catholic protest and petition with wild charges of sinister designs upon the government by the Catholic Church is no answer to a just contention, and is not calculated to strengthen in the hearts of Catholics loyalty and respect for the laws and Constitution of their country. May the day soon dawn when America and Americans will clearly see what the Catholic Church has done in her parish schools for the family and the state by jealously safeguarding the moral, religious, and intellectual welfare of the child, and when all will recognize the necessity and the permanence of the Catholic parish school!

PRESIDENT ROOSEVELT ON EDUCATION.

In a recent address before the Long Island Bible Society, President Roosevelt set forth a view of education held by the Catholic Church. There is in the English language no word more abused than that of education. The popular idea is that the educated man is one who has mastered the learning of the schools and the colleges. That sort of learning is but a part of education.

The Catholic Church, who through the centuries has kept the lamp of knowledge brightly burning, sets great value upon book learning. The Universities of Oxford, Cambridge, and other European seats of learning which came into existence under her fostering care attest how desirous she has always been to promote the cause of letters. But she knows that to have the perfect man intellectual development is not sufficient. It must be accompanied and purified by moral teachings. Hence the insistence of the Catholic Church upon the linking of the two.

President Roosevelt, therefore, took the Catholic view in his address before the Long Island Bible Society when he said :

“We must cultivate the mind ; but it is not enough only to cultivate the mind. With education of the mind must go the spiritual teaching which will make us turn the trained intellect to good account.

“It is an admirable thing, a most necessary thing, to have a sound body. It is an even better thing to have a sound mind. But infinitely better than either is to have that for the lack of which neither sound mind nor a sound body can atone—character. Character is in the long run the decisive factor in the life of individuals and of nations alike.

“Sometimes, in rightly putting the stress that we do upon intelligence, we forget the fact that there is something that counts more. It is a good thing to

be clever, to be able and smart; but it is a better thing to have the qualities that find their expression in the Decalogue and the Golden Rule. It is a good and necessary thing to be intelligent; it is a better thing to be straight and decent and fearless."

This is a condensed exposition of Catholic teaching in regard to education. The Church in this country has tried to carry it out by the establishment of parish schools, in which the minds of the young will be trained not in mere book learning, but, to use the words of President Roosevelt, "in the qualities that find their expression in the Decalogue and the Golden Rule." Education of this kind is a distinct gain to any country, as it will produce citizens who will recognize allegiance to the moral law.—*From the New York Freeman's Journal.*

OPINIONS FROM NON-CATHOLICS.

Rev. W. Montague Geer (Episcopalian), before the Sons of the Revolution, in New York City, just after the death of President McKinley:

This dreadful calamity looks very much like a visitation on us of the wrath of the Most High. We must get back to the guiding principles of our forefathers. There were two evils in our great country: first the sin of slavery,—that we have expiated and wiped out; then the sin of intemperance,—that we can master and are mastering. . . . Is there, then, any evil still in the land so widespread as to call down the wrath of God upon us? There is. Our Godless system of education is a far worse crime than slavery or intemperance. I believe that the United States is suffering from the wrath of God to-day because our people have consented to the banishment of Jesus Christ from the daily lives of our children. If to-day Christ were on earth and should enter almost any public school-house in the country, the teacher acting under instruction would show Him the door. If, on the other hand, He were to enter any of our private (parish) schools, He would be worshipped by teacher and scholars on bended knee. Here is our fault, here is our sin. The question now is, To what extent can we remould and remodel our educational system? Almost any system is better than the present one. It would be infinitely better to divide up the money received from the school tax among the various Christian denominations and the Hebrews than to continue the present irreligious system.—*St. Paul's Church, New York City, September, 1901.*

The Methodist writes editorially:

In our judgment the denominational schools of the land, as compared with the purely secular or state schools, are on moral grounds incomparably the safer. Our state institutions, as a general thing, are the hotbeds of infidelity—not less than of vice. That unbelief should be fostered and fomented therein is not unnatural. We thoroughly believe that our Church should invest at least ten millions of dollars in the next ten years in denominational schools. Why? Because we believe this system is the AMERICAN ONE AND THE ONLY SAFE ONE.—*Literary Digest, Vol. vii., No. 7.*

From the Brooklyn (N. Y.) *Eagle*, June 1, 1902 :

Right and wrong in the affairs of conduct are not matters of instinct ; they have to be learned, just as really in fact as history or handicrafts. Is this knowledge being imparted to our children in any efficient way and by any efficient teachers? Is the public school doing it? Is the Church doing it? Are fathers and mothers doing it? We are compelled to say No to all these queries. . . . The truth is, we are taking for granted a moral intelligence which does not exist. We are leaning upon it, depending upon it, trusting to it, and it is not there.

Our whole machinery of education from the kindergarten up to the university is perilously weak at this point. We have multitudes of youths and grown men and women who have no more intelligent sense of what is right and wrong than had so many Greeks of the time of Alcibiades. . . . The great Roman Catholic Church . . . is unquestionably right in the contention that the whole system as it now exists is morally a negation. . . .

The great company of educators and the whole American community need to be sternly warned that if morality cannot be specifically taught in the public schools without admitting religious dogma, then religious dogma may have to be taught in them. For righteousness is essential to a people's very existence. And righteousness does not come by nature any more than reading or writing does. . . . We are within measurable distance of the time when society may for its own sake go on its knees to any factor which can be warranted to make education compatible with and inseparable from morality, letting that factor do it on its own terms and teach therewith whatsoever it lists.

Rev. Hamilton Schuyler, Rector of Trinity Church, Trenton, New Jersey, December, 1902 :

Another point, which it seems to me calls for our admiration, is the supreme importance attributed by Roman Catholics to the religious education of their children. Viewing the matter from this stand-point, we must admit that they are justified in establishing their own schools, where their children may be taught the religion which they profess. The absolute necessity of inculcating the truths of religion while the child is yet in its most impressionable stage is one which is generally recognized by all parties. Bodies other than Roman Catholic attempt to do this in Sunday-school. Roman Catholics believe that such teaching of religion is not sufficient. They desire that religion shall enter into the daily life of their child, and that a knowledge of it shall go hand-in-hand with secular studies. Who shall say that they are wrong? Certainly the fact that they willingly bear the great expense of supporting their parish schools when they might send their children without cost to the public schools, is the best evidence that they are animated by purely conscientious motives.

Rev. R. C. Moberly, D.D., Regius Professor of Pastoral Theology in the University of Oxford ; Canon of Christ Church :

It cannot be too often or too strongly insisted that there is no such thing



as purely negative teaching. Every negative contains an affirmation, and every omission implies a positive precept. You cannot, by any possibility, forbid the teaching of what is distinctive . . . without thereby necessarily teaching that insistence on these things may be amiable but must be untrue. . . . It is only by a serious revolt against the whole principle of their own education that pupils will ever escape from its practical influence.

The fact is, that undenominationalism, so far from being unsectarian in character, is itself an instance of the sectarian spirit in its most exclusive and aggressive form. It is really itself of the nature of an attempt at a new denomination, more latitudinarian and rationalistic in basis, more illiberal and persecuting in method, than any that before exists. It sins so flagrantly against the first principles of liberalism as actually to attempt the suppression by force of the liberty of every denomination other than itself. . . . It does direct injustice, whether more or less, to every one who has serious convictions upon theological subjects.—*From pamphlet on Undenominationalism, published 1902 by John Murray, Albemarle Street, London.*

From the *North American Review*, January, 1898:

I am a Protestant of the firmest kind. . . . The Catholic Church has insisted that it is its duty to educate its children in such a way as to fix religious truths in the youthful mind. For this it has been assailed by the non-Catholic population; and Catholics have even been charged with being enemies of the people and of the flag. Any careful observer in the City of New York can see that the only people, as a class, who are teaching the children in the way that will secure the future of the best civilization are the Catholics; and, although a Protestant of the firmest kind, I believe the time has come to recognize this fact, and for us to lay aside prejudices and patriotically meet this question. The children and youth of to-day must be given such instruction in the truths of the Bible and Christian precepts as will prevent them in mature years from swinging from their moorings and being swept into the maelstrom of social and religious depravity, which threatens to engulf the religion of the future. Such instruction can only be given successfully by an almost entire change of policy and practice on the question of religious teaching in the public schools, and the encouragement of private schools in which sound religious teaching is given.

From the *Age of Steel*, October, 1896:

A boy may be kept at school for several years, . . . but if his heart is not educated with his head, his conscience with his memory, a knowledge of arithmetic and skill in penmanship, of the date of the battle of Bunker Hill and the number of gallons of water in Lake Michigan, are no guarantee that he will not use his acquired knowledge in putting the finishing touches to as consummate a scoundrel as ever entered a prison cell. So far as education goes, there are rascals who understand geometry, and can give you the distance of the sun, moon, and stars as easily as a railway conductor can punch a mileage book.—*Fred. Woodrow.*

What is the Catholic Book Exchange?

THE CATHOLIC BOOK EXCHANGE is a Missionary Institution, organized and controlled by the Paulist Fathers, for the dissemination of Catholic literature. Its object is to distribute as widespread as possible Books, Pamphlets, and Leaflets at a cost which provides simply for current expenses. Its purpose is to further the Apostolate of the Press by the sale of printed truth and to put the price of Catholic books within reach of all.

With this object in view it has printed 426,000 copies of *Plain Facts*, a book of 360 pages, and it sells for \$5.00 a hundred; also 300,000 copies of *Mass Book*, a complete Prayer Book, for 5 cents a copy. 120 West 60th Street, New York.

Orders for this pamphlet may be sent to the Catholic Book Exchange. It sells at the following

1,000 or more 1 cent each.

100 for 2 cents each.

Single Copies, 5 cents, Postage

President Hyde, of Bowdoin College, before the Massachusetts Teachers Association of Boston, November, 1896:

The public school must do more than it has been doing if it is to be a real educator of youth and an effective supporter of the state. It puts the pen of knowledge in the child's hand, but fails to open the treasures of wisdom to his heart and mind. Of what use is it to teach a child how to read, if he cares to read nothing but the sensational accounts of crime? These people who know how to read and write and cipher, and know little else,—these are the people who furnish fuel for A. P. A. fanaticism; who substitute theosophy for religion, passion for morality, impulse for reason, crazes and caprice for conscience and the Constitution.

From the *Educational Review*, February, 1898:

A little less than fifty per cent. of all the children of our country frequent Sunday-school. The meaning of these figures is simply overwhelming. More than one-half of the children of this land now receive no religious education. . . . Even this feature does not show all the truth. It seems to me that those who attend Sunday-school are receiving proper religious instruction; but every one knows this cannot be granted.—*Dr. Levi Seeley of the Normal School, Trenton, N. J.*

Wallace Radcliffe (Presbyterian):

Church-life we recognize the Trinity: home, school, and Church, and this is not easily broken. The home is a school, the school is a home. Intelligible Christianity which loses sight of this important factor is no help to our Church. . . . It is something that your children go to school more that they go to a school of your own religious belief. It is common to you to bring up your children in your own faith. Let us . . . and teach our religious convictions.—*Washington Post*, 7, 1900.

Wolf, Professor at Gettysburg Theological Seminary, National Alliance:

For the most part been cast out of our public schools. The highest and noblest, is exercised and invigorated; but that which is designed to animate and govern all is ignored; and, unless its education can be secured, it will be graduated from our schools as moral imbeciles, creating a grave social problem.—*The Philadelphia*

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS



0 029 445 882 7

